

REMARKS

The office action of June 27, 2008, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Minnerop et al.

Claims 1-3, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over SMS Demag Newsletter.

Claims 1-6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Wilson.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Wilson in view of the patent to Aratani et al.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Wilson in view of the patent to Uppaluri.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the methods disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, applicant has reviewed all of the references cited by the Examiner. Although Minnerop et al. might disclose pretesting roll sets, and Wilson and the SMS Demag Newsletter disclose that it is known to make roll stands driveable into and out of a rolling line, these references disclose no more than is disclosed in the first 9 lines of claim 1. None of the references give any indication that a complete unit with all the associated drive elements, control elements, fastening elements, as well as pipes, cables, and other pieces of equipment necessary for operation are installed or assembled on the machine/foundation block before insertion into the production line. The SMS Demag Newsletter and Wilson only discuss a stand and a foundation, but not of all the auxiliary equipment needed to make a complete functional unit. None of the references disclose or teach a method for installing machine foundations and/or rolling stands in an existing production line of a hot rolling mill and/or for putting them into service in such plants, wherein all the associated drive elements, control elements, fastening elements, as well as pipes, cables, and other pieces of equipment necessary for operation are installed or assembled on the machine/foundation block before insertion into the production line so that the equipment can be immediately used once in place

HM-743

in the production line.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-6, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and the rejections of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Klaus P. Stoffel

Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner

Reg. No. 29,482

317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910

New York, New York 10017

(212) 986-3114

Dated: November 28, 2008



HM-743

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 28, 2008.

By: Klaus P. Stoffel
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: November 28, 2008